

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43*bis*.1)

27 AUG 2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

(50531) 61

International application No.

International filing date (day/month/year)

Priority date (day/month/year)

PCT/US04/10667

05 April 2004 (05.04.2004)

03 April 2003 (03.04.2003)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(7): C08F 265/06, 04 and US Cl.: 525/50, 193, 194; 524/500, 440

Applicant

VOC FREE, INC.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No.

Authorized officer

David Wu

Jean Proctor
Paralegal Specialist

Telephone No. (571)272 1114

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US04/10667

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐ a sequence listing

☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐ in written format

☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐ contained in international application as filed.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US04/10667

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>2, 5-30</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1, 3, 4</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>2, 5-30</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1, 3, 4</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-30</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1, 3, 4 lack novelty under PCT Article 33 (2) as being anticipated by Emmonds et al. (US 4,097,677) that discloses compounds that may be used with other polymers with low Tg in the presence of organometallic catalysts to modify the components of the mixture to be used as coating compositions (column 1, lines 33-68), column 4, lines 31-69), columns 9, 18 and 19.

Claims 3, 5-30 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33 (2)-(3) because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the use of a reactive amine with the compositions of claim 1, or the use of compositions as claimed in claims 1, 3 or 4 as a coalescent system for other polymer latexes.

Claims 1-30 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US04/10667

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the questions whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

The claims 1, 5, 8, are indefinite because the claim language includes two transitional phrases, "comprising" and "consisting essentially of". "Essentially consisting of" in claim 1 is construed as "consisting essentially of". In the present search report, the claimed are interpreted as including "comprising".